downloading at least one of the plurality of recipe programs to ~~an~~ the intelligent appliance; and

after downloading at least one of the plurality of recipe programs to the intelligent appliance, transmitting, without user intervention, a new recipe program to the intelligent appliance.

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are pending and rejected in the above-identified application. With this Amendment, claims 1, 10, and 18-20 were amended.

Claims 1-6 and 10-17

Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Furlong* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123824) and *Ali* (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,818). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As the Examiner admits in the Office Action, *Furlong* does not teach "storing the plurality of recipe programs in a user profile." However, the Examiner then argues that *Ali* may be combined with *Furlong* to teach this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to clarify that the user profile is stored in "a location remote from the intelligent appliance." *Ali* does not disclose or even suggest this limitation. *Ali* teaches an appliance that may have multiple user profiles stored in a memory in the appliance so that cooking instructions can be altered depending on the person using the appliance. By contrast, claims 1 and 10 require that a selected plurality of recipe programs are stored in a user profile in a remote location. This allows numerous advantages such as maintaining a central database of recipes for any intelligent appliances in a household,

allowing for automatic updates of the recipes in the user profile, or creating requests in the user profile for new recipes that are not presently available. As the cited references do not disclose "storing the plurality of recipe programs in a user profile in a location remote from the intelligent appliance", Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 10, as well as dependent Claims 2-6 and 11-17 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7 and 9

In the Office Action, Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Furlong*. Applicant also respectfully traverses this rejection.

First, Applicant submits that *Furlong* does not teach a user identifier that identifies a record in a database. *Furlong* discloses that a bar code scanner can be used to scan a UPC code and then to download a recipe from a database based on the UPC code. In the Office Action, the Examiner identifies the UPC code as the user identifier element. However, the UPC code identifies the specific recipe that is required, not the identity of either the user or the household. In fact, claim 7 specifically requires a unique product code, which is separate from the user identifiable element. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Furlong* does note teach or even suggest "a user identifier element."

Second, Applicant also submits that *Furlong* does not teach either "an appliance identifier element linked to the user identifier element" or "a plurality of recipe program elements linked to the appliance identifier element." In the Office Action, the Examiner simply points to the appliance in *Furlong* as disclosing the appliance identifier element. However, the mere presence of an appliance does not disclose or even suggest the use of an appliance identifier element. First, as there are not multiple appliances in *Furlong* (or even *Ali*) connecting to one database, there is simply no teaching to associate any recipe programs in the database based on the type

appliance. Moreover, because *Furlong* only discloses a single appliance that can connect to the relevant database, there is no need to identify the appliance. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 7, as well as dependent claim 9, is in condition for allowance.

Claims 18, 19 and 20

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Furlong*. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Furlong* and *Ali*. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Furlong* and *Ali*, as applied to claim 20 above, an further in view of *Krichilsky et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0152200).

As amended claims 18, 19, and 20 each recite a "user profile in a location remote from an intelligent appliance," Applicant submits that claims 18, 19, and 20 are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above for claims 1 and 10.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 29, 2004

By: _____

Jordan A. Sigale
Registration No. 39,028
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

14392539